

**Capital Facilities Grants Prioritization  
State Library Board Evaluation Rubric**

**SCORE**

<b>REQUIRED CRITERIA</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Goals of the Application / Capital Project</b>	The project has a critical infrastructure requirement.	The project has an essential infrastructure requirement.	The project has an important infrastructure requirement.	The project has a worthwhile infrastructure component.
<b>Public Benefit</b>	There is evidence of very strong internal <u>and</u> external public benefit for the project on a very broad scale.	There is evidence of strong internal <u>or</u> external public benefit for the project on a wide scale.	There is evidence of sufficient internal or external public benefit for the project.	There is evidence that neither internal nor external public benefit for the project is sufficient to justify funding at the level requested.
<b>Strategic Value of Partnership(s)</b>	The evidence indicates that the partners participating in this project bring significant new and/or strengthened strategic value to this library and even libraries in general.	The evidence indicates that the partners participating in this project bring new or important strategic value to this library and possibly libraries in general.	The evidence indicates worthwhile levels of support from partners.	The strategic value of partners in this project appears to be insufficient to justify funding at the level requested.

OPTIONAL CRITERIA	SCORE			
	6	4	2	1
<b>Costs/Efficiencies</b>	The evidence indicates that the project is in the top one quarter of considered projects in terms of high efficiency, low cost, and high benefits.	The evidence indicates that the project is in the second one quarter of considered projects in terms of high efficiency, low cost, and high benefits.	The evidence indicates that the project is in the third one quarter of considered projects in terms of high efficiency, low cost, and high benefits.	The evidence indicates that the project is in the bottom one quarter of considered projects in terms of high efficiency, low cost, and high benefits.
<b>Other</b>	The additional evidence strongly suggests that the project should receive a much more favorable evaluation.	The additional evidence suggests that the project should receive a more favorable evaluation.	The additional evidence may suggest that the project should receive a slightly more favorable evaluation.	The additional evidence is not clearly relevant to project prioritization.

#### Weightings

Goals of Project - 25%

Public Benefit - 25%

Strategic Value - 25%

Costs/Efficiencies + Other - 25%